



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/577,317	05/21/2007	Viktor Rupp	2003P16610WOUS	4970
22116	7590	12/16/2010	EXAMINER	
SIEMENS CORPORATION INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH ISELIN, NJ 08830			ROSEN, NICHOLAS D	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3625		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		12/16/2010		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/577,317	RUPP, VIKTOR	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Nicholas D. Rosen	3625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 January 2009.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 20-39 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 28 April 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>6/11/2007 and 1/20/2009</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 20-39 have been examined.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claims 21-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the second line of claim 21, “a Internet page” should be “an Internet page”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 25-31 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the second line of claim 25, “a number of databases” should be “a plurality of databases” to conform to typical claim language. One is a number; therefore the claim language as it stands might arguably be met by a single database. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 26-31 are objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 26, “a selection criteria” should be either “a selection criterion” or “selection criteria”, and later occurrence of “the selection criteria” in claim 26 should be compatible with the choice. “Criterion” is the singular form, and “criteria” the plural. In claim 29, “assigned to an economic area” would better be “assigned to a respective economic area”, to avoid having the claim read on the situation of multiple databases being assigned to the same country or other economic area. Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 32-38 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 32, “an first Internet Web page” should be “a first Internet Web page”. In claim 33, “and each database” would better be “wherein each database”; also, “assigned to an economic area” would better be “assigned to a respective economic

area”, to avoid having the claim read on the situation of multiple databases being assigned to the same country or other economic area. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 39 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the first line of the claim, “a import” should be “an import”. In the third line of the claim, “collecting a spare part offer from a plurality of spare part suppliers” should be “collecting a spare part offer from each of a plurality of spare part suppliers” or “collecting spare part offers from a plurality of spare part suppliers” to avoid reciting collecting one offer from multiple suppliers, an unlikely situation; also, the next line refers to compiling spare parts offers, plural. In the ninth line of claim 39, “the spare parts” should be “spare part,” singular, since the previous basis is for selecting and purchasing a spare part. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20 and 25-31 are directed to methods. One tool for assisting in determining whether the claimed invention is directed to a statutory process under 35 U.S.C. 101 is the “machine-or-transformation” test. If a claimed method meets the “machine-or-transformation” test, the method is likely to be patent-eligible under 35 U.S.C. 101 unless there is a clear indication that the

method is directed to an abstract idea. If a claimed method does not meet the “machine-or-transformation” test, the claim will be considered to be directed to a non-statutory process unless there is a clear indication that the method is not directed to an abstract idea.

An analysis of method claims using the “machine-or-transformation” test seeks to determine whether the claimed method is (1) tied to a particular machine or apparatus, or (2) physically transforms a particular article to a different state or thing. In addition, mere field of use limitations or limitations reciting insignificant extra-solution activity will not transform an unpatentable process into a patentable one as the machine or transformation must impose meaningful limits on the method claim’s scope.

In the instant case, claims 20 and 25-31 recite a method that is not tied to a particular machine, and does not physically transform a particular article to a different state or thing. Claim 20 recites storing the spare part list in a computerized database, but this is held to be merely insignificant extra-solution activity, in that it does not recite a particular computer or other machine, and there is no recitation of how the stored list is displayed; the step of displaying the list could involve merely displaying a printed list to an interested person who comes by. Claims 25-31 likewise do not recite anything particularly technological about databases or other machines, and, for example, the entering and outputting steps of claim 26 need not involve a particular computer, or necessarily involve any computer at all. Accordingly, these claims fail to set forth a statutory process under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 32-38 are not rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, because, based on the specification, the server database, transferer, and debiter of claim 32 are not interpreted as being pure software; also, the transferer and debiter are not interpreted as being human beings. However, this point may have to be revisited should Applicant go on record with interpretations of the claim broad enough to make its recitation non-statutory.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: any structural relationship between the “demonstration mode” and “capabilities” of claims 37 and 38, and the computer system. A “capability” as such is an abstraction, not structure, and therefore has no structural cooperative relationship. Likewise, a program can have a demonstration mode, as can, therefore, the computer running the program, but the demonstration mode in itself is an abstraction, not structure.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 3625

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt (U.S. Patent 7,376,599) in view of Purcell (U.S. Patent 6,601,043) and official notice. As per claim 20, Gerhardt a method for providing spare parts for a client, comprising: collecting a plurality of spare part offers from a plurality of spare part suppliers; compiling the spare part offers into a spare part list; and storing the spare part list in a computerized database (Abstract; column 3, lines 1-50). Gerhardt does not disclose displaying the stored list for a spare part client, but Purcell teaches displaying a list of products from different vendors for a client (column 6, lines 29-48; column 7, lines 9-36 and 49-54). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to display the stored list for a spare part client, for the obvious advantage, as in Purcell, of enabling a buyer to view multiple parts or other items for sale, enabling the buyer to make a selection.

Gerhardt further discloses purchasing the spare part from the spare part supplier by the spare part client; and selling the spare part from the spare part supplier to the spare part client (column 5, lines 13-42). Gerhardt does not disclose selecting a spare part from the displayed list by the spare part client, but official notice is taken that it is well known to select an item from for purchase from a displayed list (e.g., online product catalog). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to select a spare part from the

displayed list by the spare part client, for the obvious advantage of enabling the client to purchase a spare part most in accordance with his needs and budget.

As per claim 21, Gerhardt discloses that the method is performed via at least one Internet page (column 3, lines 1-34).

As per claim 22, Gerhardt does not disclose electronically processing a payment transaction for the purchase and sale of the spare parts, but official notice is taken that it is well known to electronically process payment transactions for online purchases. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to electronically process a payment transaction for the purchase and sale of the spare parts, for the obvious advantage of enabling payment between geographically distant parties to be readily carried out.

As per claims 23 and 24, Gerhardt does not disclose forming a sales contract between a selected supplier and method operator, and a purchase contract between the method operator and the spare parts client at the conclusion of the electronic payment transaction, but official notice is taken that it is well known for an intermediary to purchase items from a supplier and sell them to a buyer, forming appropriate sales contracts. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to form the sales contracts, for the obvious advantage of the method operator profiting from a mark-up; and for such obvious advantages as enabling commerce to take place when the supplier and client do not know or trust each other, and arranging commerce when it is desired to keep the

supplier and client from doing business with each other directly, lest they decide to eliminate the middleman and his opportunity to charge fees.

As per claim 25, Gerhardt discloses compiling the spare part list via access to uploads from a plurality of sellers (column 3, lines 1-50). Gerhardt does not expressly disclose access to a plurality of databases, but official notice is taken that it is well known to keep inventory or price information in databases. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the displayed list to be compiled via access to a number of databases, as an obvious consequence of multiple sellers uploading information from their databases.

As per claim 26, Gerhardt does not disclose entering selection criteria and outputting a list of spare parts based on the selection criteria, but Purcell teaches entering selection criteria and outputting a list of products based on the selection criteria (Abstract; column 4, lines 36-47; column 5, lines 28-40; column 7, lines 26-36; column 9, line 62, through column 10, line 43). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to enter selection criteria and outputting a list of spare parts based on the selection criteria, for the stated advantage of a greater array of products not causing confusion or becoming burdensome, since the buyers can filter what is displayed at any one time.

As per claim 27, Gerhardt discloses that spare parts offers offered by the client are identified in a spare parts list presented to the client for identification of own offers of a spare parts supplier (column 4, lines 30-37).

As per claim 28, Gerhardt does not disclose that the method operator organizes the transportation of the purchased spare part, but official notice is taken that it is well known for an intermediary to arrange transportation of an ordered or purchased item. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the method operator to organize the transportation of the purchased spare part, for the obvious advantage of profiting from charging for transport services; or, from another perspective, for the obvious advantage of having transport organized by a specialist in organizing it, who may deliver items more cheaply due to economies of scale.

Claims 29, 30, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt, Purcell, and official notice as applied to claim 28 above, and further in view of Walker et al. (U.S. Patent 6,249,772). As per claim 29, teaches a database of product and price information, and identifying a seller within a buyer's geographic and thus economic area (column 5, line 65, through column 6, line 14). Walker does not teach a plurality of databases, each assigned to a respective economic area, but the duplication of known features for multiple effect is held to be within the level of one of ordinary skill in the relevant art (*St. Regis Paper Co. vs. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F.2d 833 [7th Cir. 1977]; *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380; 274 F.2d 669 [CCPA 1960]). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have a number (greater than one) of server databases, with each database assigned to a (respective) economic

area, for the obvious advantage of maintaining data on sellers in different countries or other economic areas.

As per claims 30 and 31, neither Gerhardt nor Walker teaches that the economic area is a country having a restricted or closed economy, or the Russian Federation in particular, but official notice is taken that there are countries with economies which are restricted or closed to various degrees, and in particular, that the Russian Federation exists, and has a more restricted economy than some might approve of, and that these things were true before Applicant's priority date. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the economic area to be a country having a restricted or closed economy, and the Russian Federation in particular, for the obvious advantage of selling to buyers in Russia or other countries with restricted economies, or buyers wishing to make gifts or otherwise arrange shipments to third parties in such countries.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt (U.S. Patent 7,376,599) in view of official notice. Gerhardt discloses a computer system for providing spare parts for a client, comprising: a server database for storing a list of spare parts (Abstract; column 3, lines 1-50), by which first clients (sellers) can enter spare parts in the list (*ibid.*), and second clients (buyers) can select and order spare parts from the list (*ibid.*). Gerhardt does not expressly disclose first and second Internet Web pages for these purposes, but does disclose the use of Internet Web pages (column 3, lines 1-34); hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have such first and second Internet Web pages, for the obvious advantage of readily enabling the first and second clients to enter information and receive acknowledgments, etc.

Gerhardt does not expressly disclose entering associated purchase prices, but official notice is taken that it is well known for listings of products for sale to have associated purchase prices. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for first clients to enter associated purchase prices, for the obvious advantages of enabling an intermediary to match buyers with spare parts at acceptable prices and/or enabling potential buyers to know what the prices were, and thus decide whether they were willing to pay them.

Gerhardt discloses receiving purchase orders and shipping spare parts (column 5, lines 13-42), but does not expressly disclose a transferer for transferring the purchase price of the spare part to an account of a user of the first client and a debiter for debiting a user account of the second client with the order amount. However, official notice is taken that it is well known to transfer purchase prices to sellers, and debit the accounts of buyers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have such a transferer and debiter, for the obvious advantage of arranging payment for the spare part.

Claims 33, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt and official notice as applied to claim 32 above, and further in view of Walker et al. (U.S. Patent 6,249,772). As per claim 33, Walker teaches a

database of product and price information, and identifying a seller within a buyer's geographic and thus economic area (column 5, line 65, through column 6, line 14).

Walker does not teach a plurality of databases, each assigned to a respective economic area, but the duplication of known features for multiple effect is held to be within the level of one of ordinary skill in the relevant art (*St. Regis Paper Co. vs. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8, 11; 549 F.2d 833 [7th Cir. 1977]; *In re Harza*, 124 USPQ 378, 380; 274 F.2d 669 [CCPA 1960]). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have a number (greater than one) of server databases, with each database assigned to a (respective) economic area, for the obvious advantage of maintaining data on sellers in different countries or other economic areas.

As per claims 34 and 35, neither Gerhardt nor Walker teaches that the economic area is a country having a restricted or closed economy, or the Russian Federation in particular, but official notice is taken that there are countries with economies which are restricted or closed to various degrees, and in particular, that the Russian Federation exists, and has a more restricted economy than some might approve of, and that these things were true before Applicant's priority date. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the economic area to be a country having a restricted or closed economy, and the Russian Federation in particular, for the obvious advantage of selling to buyers in Russia or other countries with restricted economies, or buyers wishing to make gifts or otherwise arrange shipments to third parties in such countries.

Claims 36, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt, Walker, and official notice as applied to claim 35 above, and further in view of Purcell (U.S. Patent 6,601,043). As per claim 36, Gerhardt does not quite disclose that a selected list of spare parts is created by entering selection criteria into the computer system (at least one spare part is selected, but not explicitly a list). However, Purcell teaches creating a selected list of spare parts by entering selection criteria into a computer system (Abstract; column 4, lines 36-47; column 5, lines 28-40; column 7, lines 26-36; column 9, line 62, through column 10, line 43). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to create a selected list of spare parts by entering selection criteria into a computer system, for the obvious advantage of enabling the client/buyer to select the spare part or other product most suitable for his wants, and within his budget from the list, and for the stated advantage of a greater array of products not causing confusion or becoming burdensome, since the buyers can filter what is displayed at any one time.

As per claim 37, Gerhardt does not disclose a demonstration mode for the individual functions of the system, but official notice is taken that it is well known for programs or computer systems to have demonstration modes. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the system to comprise a demonstration mode, for the obvious advantage of enabling potential users to see how the system worked, and discover its

advantages and possible pitfalls, before actually using it and being committed to make actual offers of payment or of spare parts for sale, and use real money.

Gerhardt does not expressly disclose the capability for registration of a new user, although one could take the view that a Web server (as disclosed in column 3, lines 1-34) has the capability to do so with appropriate programming). However, official notice is taken that it is well known for Web server systems to have the actual, active capability for registration of new users. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the system to have the capability for registration of a new user, for such obvious advantages as adding a user's email or other address to the list of those to receive information, checking the new user's credit rating or other evidence of legitimacy, and setting the system up to accept information from the registered new user (note that in the first paragraph of claim 3, Gerhardt discloses, "As is known in the art, the system **10** may also include firewall protection [not show] to prevent non-system participants from gaining access thereto.")

As per claim 38, Gerhardt discloses a Web server for communicating with users (column 3, lines 1-34) and engaging in electronic commerce (whole patent); therefore, the Web server system has the capability to electronically download and execute a contract.

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhardt (U.S. Patent 7,376,599) in view of Purcell (U.S. Patent 6,601,043) and official notice.

Gerhardt a method for providing spare parts for a client, comprising: collecting spare part offers from a plurality of spare part suppliers; compiling the spare part offers into a spare part list; and storing the spare part list in a computerized database (Abstract; column 3, lines 1-50). Gerhardt does not disclose displaying the stored list for a spare part client, but Purcell teaches displaying a list of products from different vendors for a client (column 6, lines 29-48; column 7, lines 9-36 and 49-54), and further teaches selecting an item from the displayed list by the client (column 10, lines 23-43). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to display the stored list for a spare part client, for the obvious advantage, as in Purcell, of enabling a buyer to view multiple parts or other items for sale, enabling the buyer to make a selection; and to select a spare part from the list, for the obvious advantage of enabling the client to obtain a part best suiting his needs and budget, and, as per Purcell, enabling the operator of an intermediary website to collect fees (column 10, lines 23-43).

Gerhardt further discloses purchasing the spare part from the spare part supplier by the spare part client (column 5, lines 13-42); Purcell also discloses purchasing an item from a supplier by a client (column 10, lines 23-43). Gerhardt further discloses electronic data exchange between supplier and client, and fulfillment of the purchase (column 5, lines 13-42), which implies executing an electronic sales contract between the spare part supplier and the spare part client; and arranging transportation of the purchased spare part from the spare part supplier to the spare part client (column 5, lines 32-35). Gerhardt does not disclose electronically processing a payment

transaction for the purchase and sale of the spare parts, but official notice is taken that it is well known to electronically process payment transactions for online purchases. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to electronically process a payment transaction for the purchase and sale of the spare parts, for the obvious advantage of enabling payment between geographically distant parties to be readily carried out.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Tait et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0103727) disclose a data management system. Tenzer et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2005/0065858) disclose a system and method for improved excess inventory distribution.

Scroggie et al. (EP 0 986 016 A1) disclose a system and method for distributing information through cooperative communication network sites. Berlin et al. (WO 02/073492 A1) disclose centralized electronic sales using a consolidator.

Pele ("The New Webtopia") discloses, inter alia, a website with different domain names for different countries (paragraph beginning, "SCA Hygiene Products, Stureplan, Sweden"). Kim ("On the Benefits of Inventory-Pooling in Production-Inventory Systems") discloses consolidating inventory.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith, can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas D. Rosen/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625  
December 15, 2010